

**APPROVED  
MINUTES  
NORTHWEST PROGRESSO – FLAGLER HEIGHTS  
REDEVELOPMENT ADVISORY BOARD  
FORT LAUDERDALE  
100 NORTH ANDREWS AVENUE  
8<sup>th</sup> FLOOR CONFERENCE ROOM  
JUNE 22, 2011 – 3:30 P.M.**

**Cumulative Attendance**

<b><u>Members Present</u></b>	<b><u>Attendance</u></b>	<b>May 2011 - April 2012</b>	
		<b><u>Present</u></b>	<b><u>Absent</u></b>
Steve Lucas, Chair	P	2	0
Ella Phillips, Vice Chair (dep. 4:47)	P	2	0
Jessie Adderley (arr. 3:45)	P	2	0
Sonya Burrows (arr. 3:49)	P	1	0
Ron Centamore	P	2	0
Nate Ernest-Jones	A	1	1
Alan Gabriel	P	2	0
Mickey Hinton	P	1	1
Bradley Hubert	P	2	0
Brice Lambrix	P	1	1
Yvonne Sanandres (dep. 4:51)	P	1	1
Doug Sterner (arr. 4:10 dep. 4:53)	P	2	0
John Wilkes	P	1	1
Samuel Williams	P	2	0

Currently there are 14 appointed members to the Board, which means 8 would constitute a quorum.

**Staff**

Alfred Battle, Director, CRA  
Sandra Douglin, Clerk III, CRA  
Barbara Hartmann, Recording Secretary, Prototype, Inc.

**Communications to the City Commission**

None.

**I. Call to Order / Roll Call**

Chair Lucas called the meeting to order at 3:40 p.m. and roll was called. The Chair welcomed new member Yvonne Sanandres to the Board. She is a mortgage broker and realtor, and has lived in the area for the last 15 years.

## **II. Approval of Minutes from May 25, 2011 Meeting**

**Motion** made by Mr. Gabriel, seconded by Mr. Williams, to approve the minutes of the May 25, 2011 meeting. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

## **ACTION ITEM**

### **III. Funding Request – Reliance Housing – Eclipse Phase II Park Impact Fee Waiver / Funding Request**

Chair Lucas introduced Nectaria Chakas and Sandra Seals, representing Reliance Housing. Ms. Chakas explained they are requesting a park impact waiver fee for the second phase of the Eclipse project. The fees due for this phase would total \$186,300. The impact fee waiver is requested for all 96 units, which range from studios to two-bedroom and -bath units.

Ms. Chakas showed an aerial photograph of the project, identifying the phase already in place. The Eclipse project is an affordable housing project and therefore qualifies for the requested waiver. All units must be affordable housing for the next 50 years to satisfy land use and zoning restrictions. Rentals will be to low- and very low-income individuals and/or families. A parking garage will be constructed as part of phase two, and will service both towers of the project.

Ms. Adderley arrived at 3:45 p.m.

Mr. Williams asked what the total cost of phase two would be. Ms. Chakas said it is just under \$25 million, including the cost of the parking garage. Mr. Battle recalled that phase one of the project received a parking fee waiver and streetscape improvements from the Board. The CRA provided approximately \$400,000 in assistance to the first phase.

Mr. Wilkes said he had previously spoken to Ms. Chakas to express concern regarding the minimum number of parking spaces, based upon the project's proximity to mass transit and the estimated demographics of the occupants. He said the space seems to be sufficient. He concluded that while the request is not an unreasonable one, he did not like to see the same project come before the Board multiple times with multiple requests.

He asked Staff if the project fits into the scheme of the allocation of projects in one area, or if one project is being "overextended" versus another. Mr. Battle said there was no overextension, and noted that the Board's backup information shows the taxes generated by the project, which came to approximately \$95,000 in 2010, or \$900 per unit. The addition of 96 more units will provide an additional

income stream in the CRA, which could be “a way to repay ourselves” for investing in the project.

Mr. Gabriel asked if the impact fees were established by the formula in the Ordinance, and if the request is for the entire amount to be waived. This was confirmed. Mr. Battle added that while the fees are not technically waived, this is how the Resolution refers to the practice.

**Motion** made by Mr. Williams, seconded by Mr. Hubert, to accept the project. In a voice vote, the **motion** passed unanimously.

Ms. Burrows arrived at 3:50 p.m. Chair Lucas welcomed her to the Board and invited her to introduce herself. Ms. Burrows was born and raised in Fort Lauderdale and owns an electrical contracting company.

#### **Discussion Items**

#### **IV. Update – Joint Workshop**

Chair Lucas stated the joint workshop is still scheduled for Tuesday, June 28, at 7 p.m. at the Mizell Center. He explained that today Mr. Battle would show the Board the PowerPoint presentation he plans to show the City Commission at that meeting. The Board will also discuss how to facilitate the joint meeting and keep it organized.

Mr. Battle showed the Board this PowerPoint presentation, stating that he planned to walk the City Commission through what the Board does and how it functions, as well as those success stories for which they can take credit. He discussed the history of the Board, the boundaries of the CRA, and the adoption of projects when incremental revenue became available and allowed the Board to implement a workable plan consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

He recalled that the current City Commission had received copies of the Implementation Plan from 2008 when they took office in 2009. There were eight goals and five key initiatives adopted by the former CRA Board, which focus on what can be done on a day-to-day basis to implement the redevelopment plan. These include infill housing, small business development, connections and green streets, and other plans.

Mr. Williams asked if it would be possible to prioritize all the goals. Mr. Battle stated that all goals in the 1400 acre CRA are important; when allocating resources, he advised that he would give priority to those projects that would give the largest return on investment.

He showed the Board a slide listing all CRA projects since 2005, some of which are complete and some of which are in progress. These 30 projects have been helped in various ways by roughly \$14 million, 80%-90% of which came from CRA funds. Some of the projects were also pictured on slides, broken up into separate areas of the CRA. These included condominiums and apartments such as Bamboo Flats, Flagler Village, Dorsey Riverbend, Dixie Court, and Progresso Village. Additional projects funded by the CRA were parks, façade programs, law offices and executive suites, streetscapes, sidewalks, and crosswalks.

Mr. Battle showed a summary of the CRA's revenue and expenses, showing where they currently stand financially and where they would like to be before the end of the CRA in 2025. Revenue last year was \$5.3 million, while this year it is projected to be \$4.8 million according to the June estimate. The operating budget has increased slightly, primarily due to the increase in operating expenses and debt services. He noted that the payment fluctuates slightly from one year to the next, and this amount could increase closer to the end of the fiscal year.

He continued that the CRA's reserve account functions similarly to a trust fund: it is unencumbered for any specific purpose other than the redevelopment of the area. The park impact fee waiver approved earlier, for example, will come from this fund.

Mr. Sterner arrived at 4:10 p.m.

Mr. Battle said once the tax incremental funding (TIF) is collected and the operating budget is passed, money left over is annually added to the trust fund balance. For the current year, the CRA had just over \$2.4 million for projects; at the end of fiscal 2009-10, there had been approximately \$7 million left in the reserve fund balance, which brought the balance up to over \$9 million. If no more commitments are made before the end of this fiscal year, there will be roughly \$11.7 million to spend on projects in fiscal 2011-12.

Mr. Wilkes asked a question about bond payments. Mr. Battle said this was a loan commitment that would come due in 2013 as a "balloon payment;" the CRA will determine if their best opportunity would be to refinance this debt or to extend it. Mr. Wilkes asked if it would be extended until 2025, throughout the life of the CRA. Mr. Battle said more money may be borrowed before that time.

He noted that having this money on hand today is more valuable to the CRA than waiting for TIF to be collected between now and 2025. TIF growth is estimated at 2% each year; the revenue collected through TIF between now and 2025 is projected to be \$70 million. When the operating budget and \$12 million in repayment are backed out of this, it leaves just under \$32 million available to be used between now and 2025.

Mr. Wilkes observed that the CRA would not have \$13 million in its account to repay the loan in 2013, so it would need to be refinanced. Mr. Battle said he expected they would choose to refinance the loan, which would leave more money for other uses. Mr. Wilkes noted that the interest on the \$13 million could bring the eventual repayment amount closer to \$20 million. Mr. Battle advised he did not want to make any assumptions about what strategic action the CRA might take to have enough money to implement projects in the future.

Mr. Battle stated for purposes of discussion, the Board would also provide short-, mid-, and long-term goals. Short-term goals would include the small business incubator plan, which includes business seminars to train the existing business pool and attract other businesses to the area. Other short-term plans include work on parking requirements and design guidelines.

He continued that the CRA must be more effective in soliciting new development. While many groups come before the Board and want to undertake projects, most of these "aren't ready to do business." He added that larger and more sophisticated developers are not often fond of the RFP process and prefer to know how they may take control of a piece of property. There should also be more discussion regarding marketing and recruitment in the short term, including development of a game plan on how to spend money on ad placement and recruitment of development entities.

Mid-term projects include working with the small business revolving fund, which partners with other financial institutions so the CRA is not taking on the complete burden of financing new approaches. If several local banks that make small business loans participate equitably in a loan pool, and businesses have already been vetted by financial institutions before they come to the CRA Board, it will increase the Board's comfort level regarding the placement of money. He noted this is more of a collaborative effort rather than a CRA initiative. Mr. Hubert agreed, stating he did not like to see cities make loans to developers, as it can be difficult to get money back.

Other mid-term projects include more green streets and infill housing. Mr. Battle suggested that an online database for commercial and residential real estate could also be a useful tool, as the CRA receives multiple calls asking what properties are available. There are discussions regarding a light rail project for the Sistrunk area as phase of The Wave project, and other projects that would foster greater connectivity in the area.

Mr. Williams observed that the presentation did not greatly deviate from where the CRA began, although the City Commission has changed. Mr. Battle advised that when the City Commission met with the Beach CRA, the Advisory Board

members were asked if they would like to add any comments to the presentation. He suggested that the Board may wish to take a similar approach, although he noted that the Beach CRA's presentation was very different due to the amount of money available to them to spend.

Mr. Hubert asked what incentive could be given to developers to encourage them to build "two-storey, garden-type developments between parks and public elementary schools" and stay away from the railroad tracks. He stated that he was "turned off" by recent kinds of development in the area and felt the CRA should encourage development in more community-oriented areas. Mr. Battle said one way to encourage development in certain areas would be to encourage investments and create incentives in those areas, and ensure that the desired uses would fit comfortably in the area.

Mr. Wilkes suggested that the CRA should focus on planning how to build partnerships and market an area, which is best achieved by showing potential developers a vision for that area. He concluded that while government cannot be a developer, it can lead toward development. He felt it would be better to have a vision of what the area should be and bring in people to fulfill that vision rather than considering "whoever comes to the table" with their own suggestions. He suggested the addition of rebuilding Sistrunk to the CRA's plan and noted that the addition of light rail in this area would reduce the number of cars on the road and encourage public transportation.

Mr. Battle said he was glad to hear this kind of feedback from the Board, as they could proceed with projects such as these if they are supported. He cautioned that it would not be possible to undertake all projects at once, and the classifications of short-, mid-, and long-term would need to remain unless additional resources are brought in.

Mr. Centamore said he agreed with Mr. Wilkes that light rail could be instrumental in redeveloping the neighborhood, citing a similar system in Portland, OR as proof. He noted that Sistrunk would probably provide more ridership than any other neighborhood if bus ridership is an indication, and stated if there is a second phase to the light rail system, the CRA should encourage consideration of the Sistrunk area.

Mr. Battle asked if the members had three to five top issues they would like the joint meeting to focus on. Mr. Williams said there seems to be "a total turnaround" from the philosophy adopted by the CRA in the past and the projects they recommended, and he was not certain if this reflected the changing attitudes of the City Commission. He asked if the Board continues to function in the same capacity as an advisory body with the current City Commission as they had functioned with previous Commissions.

Mr. Battle encouraged Mr. Williams to engage the City Commission in discussion of this concern. He suggested the Board members could ask if the Commission values their vetting and recommendations of projects.

Mr. Centamore said he would like to know if the City Commission plans to embrace the implementation plan of 2008, noting that this plan was put together by the community and supported by the previous City Commission.

Mr. Gabriel said in the current economic times he felt the City should be more aggressive, and should implement changes so people could see the progress and follow it. He advised that the problem becomes what should be done to create interest by developers so they will be willing to follow.

Ms. Phillips left the meeting at 4:47 p.m.

Mr. Sterner stated he also felt the Board should discuss the issue of connectivity, pointing out that the eastern part of the CRA is close to Downtown but does not seem to be part of it. He did not feel the CRA could grow if it remains "isolated and off on our own," and added that connectivity would make a better case for implementing phase two of The Wave in the CRA area rather than the beach or other parts of the City.

Chair Lucas said he had listed four key issues for discussion thus far: implementation of the 2008 plan, advisory role of the Board, acceleration of creative financing, and connectivity.

Ms. Sanandres left at 4:51 p.m.

Chair Lucas asked how these issues would be raised before the City Commission following Mr. Battle's presentation. Mr. Gabriel suggested listing these ideas on a flip chart. Chair Lucas agreed this would be appropriate.

## **V. Director's Report**

None.

## **VI. Communication to CRA Board**

None.

## **VII. Old / New Business**

Chair Lucas said he had attended meetings of the Flagler Village Improvement Association in the past; there is now a new official neighborhood association, the Flagler Village Civic Association. Over 100 people attended their meeting the previous week. The Association has put together an outline of issues they feel are important. He advised he would send this to Mr. Battle for dissemination to the Board members, and would invite representatives of the Association to future Board meetings.

#### **VIII. Adjournment**

There being no further business to come before the Board at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

[Minutes prepared by K. McGuire, Prototype, Inc.]